

27 May 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Policy and Plans Group

FROM: [REDACTED]  
Policy and Plans Group

SUBJECT: Revision of DCID 1/14

REFERENCE: SECOM Memorandum of 24 May 1983, Untitled

1. Reference contains recommended changes to DCID 1/14 authored by the SECOM staff and distributed at the meeting of 25 May. Discussion of the changes resulted in tasking to SECOM Members to study the proposal and submit comments by 3 June. The Director of Security favored the concept of addressing unauthorized disclosures if wording does not preclude the due process of adjudication; he does not want "per se justice."

2. The attachment, a proposed response to tasking, includes a PPG rewrite of the suggested additions that concern unauthorized disclosure. They were coordinated with [REDACTED] and were accepted as a legitimate fix. Later, [REDACTED] requested permission to distribute the rewrite to SECOM Members as a "tentative" CIA suggestion. The Director of Security, after review of the rewrite, approved the SECOM request.

3. The second addition to DCID 1/14 proposed by SECOM involved development of record information from colleges/universities that would be "relevant to an assessment of the individual's character and behavior." This is not believed to be realistic in terms of what information educational institutions will provide. Further, the logic of the proposal (taken from speculation in a major espionage case) is flawed; comparing grade point average and tested scholastic aptitude is not necessarily "relevant" in measurement of honesty (this was the consideration in the espionage case). The standards of a given school and motivation of an overachiever are, among many other things, significant in any discrepancy between native ability and recorded performance.

4. The above observations were discussed informally with the SECOM staff and there was agreement that the proposal, as stated, was impractical from the investigative standpoint and weak in justification of intent. It was also developed that the SECOM staff did not have a strong interest in acceptance of the addition under discussion; this is not the case with the two additions concerning unauthorized disclosure. The Chairman,

SECOM, is anxious that the possible consequences of unauthorized disclosure be included in the directive.

5. The attached reflects the gist of this memorandum; revision of additions concerning unauthorized disclosure and non-concurrence with the passage regarding school records.



STAT

## ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Revision of DCID 1/14

FROM

Policy and Plans Group

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

27 May 1983

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

C/PPG

5/27/83

D

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

DD/OS

5/31/83

Q

8.

D/OS

31 MAY 1983

1 JUN 1983

X

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

I agree with [redacted] as far as para 4 is concerned. As far as my experience (a few years ago) that [redacted] were adamant in [redacted] this kind of data. Too many people question the [redacted] of the [redacted] SAT etc.

2.8- I frankly do not see the need for an additional paragraph. The DCID - especially in para 18 - ~~points~~ points to continuing review of clarity etc. - Again it comes down to how much warning is enough.